

questions in both scenarios, and was scored for each. For the evolving scenario, candidates were provided with a 15-minute preparation period, and candidates had 10 minutes to respond. For the arriving scenario, a five-minute preparation period was given, and candidates had 10 minutes to respond.

The candidates' responses were scored on technical knowledge and oral communication ability. Prior to the administration of the exam, a panel of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) determined the scoring criteria, using generally approved fire command practices, firefighting practices, and reference materials. Scoring decisions were based on SME-approved possible courses of action (PCAs) including those actions that must be taken to resolve the situation as presented. Only those oral responses that depicted relevant behaviors that were observable and could be quantified were assessed in the scoring process.

Candidates were rated on a five-point scale, with 5 as the optimal response, 4 as a more than acceptable passing response, 3 as a minimally acceptable passing response, 2 as a less than acceptable response, and 1 as a much less than acceptable response. For each of the scenes, and for oral communication, the requirements for each score were defined.

For the evolving scenario, the appellant scored a 5 for the technical component, a 4 for the supervision component, and a 4 for the oral communication component. For the arriving scenario, the appellant scored a 2 for the technical component, a 5 for the supervision component, and a 3 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his scores for the supervision component of the evolving scenario, and for the technical component of the arriving scenario. As a result, the appellant's test material, video, and a listing of PCAs for the scenarios were reviewed.

The evolving scenario involved a fire in the computer lab of a high school. The supervision question indicated that the candidate notices that a member of his crew is not wearing his radio, and he tells the candidate he left it in his locker. The assessor noted that the appellant missed the opportunity to reassign the firefighter to exterior operations. On appeal, the appellant states that he ordered his crew to report to the outside of the structure, ladder the building, access the roof, rear of structure and exposures, and give reports.

A review of the appellant's presentation indicates that the appellant did not reassign the firefighter to exterior operations after he indicated that he left his radio in his locker. The question asked for actions to take immediately and back at the firehouse. In responding to the question, the appellant took no immediate actions other than to tell him he would have a meeting with him at the firehouse. The fire building was large, as it was a three-story high school measuring 260 feet

by 195 feet, and the appellant provided many interior tasks in addition to the exterior tasks he listed on appeal. For example, he performed an interior search, horizontal ventilation, and utilities control. The appellant did not state that this firefighter had been assigned to outside operations and was returning there. Additionally, at the end of every scenario and prior to the questions, instructions state, "In responding to the questions, make sure your actions directly relate to the scenario. Do not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to your score." Thus, candidates were required to articulate that they were reassigning the firefighter to exterior operations, and not leave it to the assessor to assume this based on other actions. The appellant missed the actions listed by the assessor, and the score of 4 is correct.

The arriving scenario involved a train/pedestrian collision. For the technical component, the assessor indicated that the appellant failed to order a primary search of the train, and he failed to confirm the status of the pedestrian, *i.e.*, recover the body, which were mandatory responses to question 2. Lastly, he indicated that the appellant missed the opportunity relay that he was preparing for offensive operations, which was another response for question 1. On appeal, the appellant states that he took actions other than searching which were equivalent, such as securing the power, placing an aerial ladder, getting a passenger manifest and requesting a victim tracking officer. He also states that he placed a hazmat tent around the woman who may be dead.

In reply, credit cannot be given for information that is implied or assumed. Question 1 asked for an initial report to be given upon arrival at the incident, and candidates were instructed to use proper radio protocols. At no time did the appellant state that he was preparing for offensive operations. In response to question 2, the appellant did not take the actions listed by the assessor. He did not order a primary search of the train, and SMEs determined that in this situation this was a mandatory action and without ordering a primary search, the IC would be remiss in his duties. The other actions given by the appellant on appeal are not the same. Additionally, while the appellant placed a hazmat tent around the woman, he did not confirm her status first, and it would be inappropriate to place a hazmat tent around a live person. Later in the presentation, the appellant set up a one block perimeter "with the person possibly being deceased." This indicates that he did not confirm the status of the pedestrian. The appellant missed two mandatory responses, as well as the additional response, and his score of 2 for this component is correct.

CONCLUSION

A thorough review of the appellant's submissions and the test materials indicates that the decision below is amply supported by the record, and the appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 12th DAY OF JUNE, 2019



Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Anthony Sharperson
Michael Johnson
Records Center